

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Final Office Action mailed June 22, 2005. Reconsideration of this application in view of the below remarks is respectfully requested. Claims 25-56 are pending in the application with Claims 25, 36, 41, 45 and 48 being in independent form.

Regarding the Examiner's assertion that the claimed 'dissemination means' is not supported in the specification, the 'dissemination means' is represented by the 'electronic information distribution apparatus' represented by reference numeral 100 in FIG. 2 and FIG. 3.

I. Rejection of Claims 41 and 44 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 41 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,043,531 issued to Gutenson et al.

Regarding the prior art reference of Gutenson et al., the Examiner contends that the reference fully anticipates all the claimed elements recited in Claims 41 and 44. However, Gutenson fails to disclose the 'dissemination means' as defined above. Specifically, Gutenson teaches a service center 32 having a coax gateway, telephone gateway, load center, and control and data communication system. However, there are no indications that multiple connectors for each gateway/system are present. In fact, Gutenson requires a separate coaxial cable splitter 80 to distribute the coaxial signal from the service center 32 to the multiple rooms in the building. (See: Gutenson et al., FIG. 2).

Contrastingly, the dissemination means of the present application contains a plurality of connectors of several types, e.g., coaxial, RJ-45, RJ-11, fiber-optic, etc., as shown in FIG. 3 of the present application. Therefore, a separate router is not necessary.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection with respect to Claims 41 and 44 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

II. Rejection of Claims 25-29, 31-35, 42 and 43 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 25-29, 31-35, 42 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentably obvious over Gutenson et al.

Gutenson et al. fails to disclose a second and third set of connectors connected to the support means. As mentioned above, Gutenson et al. require a separate router 80 for distributing coaxial cable to a plurality of rooms. As for distribution of telephone wires, there is no mention of multiple telephone connectors located on the Gutenson et al. disclosed support means. In fact, the implication from FIG. 2 is that wiring for internal electrical power and for telephones are run along the walls, serially, from room to room, as depicted by lines 46A and 46B and thus would not be individually assigned, at the support means, to individual rooms as claimed in independent Claim 25.

Consequently, Gutenson et al. fails to anticipate all the limitations recited in independent Claim 25. In addition, Claims 26-29, 31-35, 42 and 43 depend from independent Claims 25 and 41 and thus include the limitations of these independent claims. Therefore for at least the reasons given above regarding Claims 41 and 25, Claims 26-29, 31-35, 42 and 43 are believed patentably distinct and allowable over Gutenson et al. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection with respect to Claims 25-29, 31-35, 42 and 43 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Gutenson et al.

III. Rejection of Claims 36-40 and 45-47 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 36-40 and 45-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentably obvious over Gutenson et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,869,582 issued to Humphrey et al.

As discussed above, Gutenson et al. fails to disclose a dissemination means as recited in the claims and further described in Applicants' disclosure. Humphrey et al. discloses an intra-building telephone system, which allows assignment of telephone extensions to individual phones from a central telephone patch box. However, Humphrey et al. requires multiple incoming telephone lines equal in number to the number of extensions being assigned.

For the sake of argument, if the splitter 80 of Gutenson et al. is taken as the dissemination means, as asserted by the Examiner, Humphrey et al. would not be applicable in modifying the splitter as the Examiner requires in order to disclose Applicants' recited limitations. A coaxial splitter 80 as known in the art is basically, constructed from several connectors spliced together, such that one connector acts as an input and the remaining connectors act as outputs. (See: RadioShack model no. 15-1234 for an example of a coaxial splitter). The splitter 80 of Gutenson et al. is not suggested to be anything other than this simple type of coaxial splitter nor would a more complex type of device be necessary for the Gutenson et al. system to function as intended. Therefore, there is no proper motivation to combine Gutenson et al and Humphrey et al.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection with respect to Claims 36-40 and 45-47 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Gutenson et al. in view of Humphrey et al.

IV. Rejection of Claims 30 and 48-56 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 30 and 48-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentably obvious over Gutenson et al. in view of Applicants' disclosure. Claims 30 and 48-56 depend from independent Claims 25 and 45 and thus include the limitations recited in these independent claims. Therefore, for at least the reasons given above for Claims 25 and 45, Claims 30 and 48-56 are believed patentably distinct and allowable over the cited prior art references. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection with respect to Claims 30 and 48-56 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Gutenson et al. in view of Applicants' disclosure.

CONCLUSIONS

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all claims presently pending in the application, namely, Claims 25-56 are believed to be in condition for allowance and patentably distinguishable over the art of record.

If the Examiner should have any questions concerning this communication or feels that an interview would be helpful, the Examiner is requested to call Applicant's undersigned attorney at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,


Paul J. Esatto, Jr.
Registration No. 30,749

SCULLY, SCOTT, MURPHY & PRESSER
400 Garden City Plaza - Ste. 300
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343

PJE:DAT;jam